

**INDEX TO
EVIDENTIARY HEARING TRANSCRIPTS
PETER ROSENWALD
DIRECT EXAMINATION: PAGES 461-485
CROSS-EXAMINATION: PAGES 585-590**

DEVELOPED DEFENSE

- STARTED EARLY IN THE CASE TO FORMULATE THEORIES OF DEFENSE484, LINE 11
- DEVELOPED A DEFENSE OF ACCIDENTIAL DISCHARGE BASED UPON
CONVERSATIONS WITH FEARS486, LINE 16
- TO DEVELOP THE DEFENSE, TRIED TO LOCATE SOMEBODY THAT
WOULD CORROBORATE486, LINE 20
- PROSECUTION HAD FRANKLIN, FRAZIER AND BRYANT WHO COULD
TESTIFY ABOUT ELEMENT OF PRIOR CALCULATION AND DESIGN 495, LINE 4
- AGREED THAT THOSE 3 WITNESSES ADDITIONALLY PROVIDED
EVIDENCE FOR THE FELONY MURDER; WERE EYEWITNESSES TO THE
ALLEGED AGGRAVATED BURGLARY AND KIDNAPPING 495, LINE 9
- WILL NOT LOOK INTO DEFENSE IF THERE’S NO REASON TO THINK
ABOUT IT 499, LINE 7
- “THERE’S ONLY SO MANY FACTS THAT MIGHT BE INVOLVED IN A CASE
THAT I CAN WORK WITH. I CAN’T CREATE FACTS.” 505, LINE 8
- HAD EARLY CONFERENCE IN THE CASE; WITHIN A COUPLE OF DAYS OF
INDICTMENT 578, LINE 3
- CONFERENCE WITH HIMSELF, FEARS, AND MR. KELLER578, LINE 14
- MEETING ON APRIL 22, 1997 WITH FEARS578, LINE 25

USED ACCIDENTIAL DISCHARGE INSTEAD OF VOLUNTARY INTOXICATION

- NOTES DON’T REFLECT FEARS EVER TOLD HIM HE WAS INTOXICATED
OR DRUNK OR HIGH491, LINE 21
- NOTES DO INDICIATE SUBSTANCE ABUSE ON DAY IN QUESTION491, LINE 18
- MAY HAVE CONSIDERED VOLUNTARY INTOXCATION AS DEFENSE, BUT
DIDN’T REALLY DEVELOP IT 496, LINE 7
- RELIED ON INFORMATION GIVEN BY FEARS TO DETERMINE IF THEY HAD
INTOXICATION AS A FACTOR505, LINE 19

- ACCIDENTIAL DISCHARGE DEFENSE WAS BASED UPON SOMETHING THE PROSECUTION WITNESS, FRANKLIN, SAID AT TRIAL AND WAS SUPPORTED BY FEARS.....586, LINE 21
- FRANKLIN WOULD CORROBORATE THAT FEARS WAS IN PROCESS OF HANDLING 2 GUNS AND ONE OF THEM WENT OFF 587, LINE 1
- CONSIDERED OTHER DEFENSES BESIDES ACCIDENTAL DISCHARGE 587, LINE 9
- WOULD HAVE DEVELOPED AN INTOXICATION DEFENSE IF HE FOUND IT AVAILABLE THROUGH HIS INVESTIGATION 589, LINE 2

DIDN'T PUT FEARS ON THE WITNESS STAND

- CONSIDERED PUTTING FEARS ON THE WITNESS STAND589, LINE 21
- CONSIDERED WHETHER OR NOT HE WOULD HAVE BEEN A GOOD WITNESS, BUT DECIDED HE WASN'T GOING TO TESTIFY 590, LINE 1

BELIEVES WITNESS IS REFERRING TO JAMES GRANT, NOT FEAR

- LOOKING AT TRANSCRIPT (PAGE 1470), IT DOESN'T APPEAR WHOEVER IT IS IS TALKING ABOUT ANGELO510, LINE 20
- APPEARS THE WITNESS IS TALKING ABOUT JAMES GRANT 510, LINE 2
- IN LAKESHA BRYANT'S TESTIMONY REGARDING "HE LOOKED HIGH THE NIGHT HE WAS IN MY ROOM" – REFERRING TO GRANT514, LINE 20
- TESTIMONY BY WITNESS REGARDING GOING OVER TO KENTUCKY...INFORMATION IS NOT TOTALLY RELEVANT AS IT'S RELATED TO ANGELO; MIGHT BE RELEVANT TO CREDIBILITY OF WITNESS.....515, LINE 21
- READING FROM DARIUS HARRIS'S DIRECT TESTIMONY – HARRIS DIDN'T KNOW IF ANGELO WAS INTOXICATED ON DAY IN QUESTION 583, LINE 1
- DOESN'T KNOW IF "THEY" IS REFERRING TO GRANT AND FEARS, OR GRANT AND SOMEONE ELSE583, LINE 16

EVALUATION OF MITIGATION

- THOUGHT THERE WAS A PRETTY STRONG PROBABILITY THEY'D GET TO MITIGATION.....523, LINE 19
- KNOWING THAT JURIES IN HAMILTON COUNTY ARE CONSERVATIVE.....525, LINE 19

- BY MID-WAY WAS TRYING TO GET MITIGATION BETTER ORGANIZED 525, LINE 3
- THOUGHT THE LAWYERS PRESENTED THE MITIGATION WELL IN
GETTING THE INFORMATION OUT526, LINE 13
- THOUGHT THE FAMILY DID WHAT THEY COULD TO TALK ABOUT
ANGELO’S HISTORY526, LINE 15
- INFORMATION GIVEN TO HIM LED HIM TO BELIEVE JACOBY WAS
CAPABLE OF DOING THE MITIGATION WORK IN THIS CASE549, LINE 21
- THOUGHT JACOBY DID A FAIRLY GOOD JOB IN GETTING INFORMATION
FROM ATTORNEYS; COMMUNICATING SHE DID A FAIRLY GOOD JOB526, LINE 16
- RECEIVED A LETTER DATED OCTOBER 3, 1997 FROM JACOBY WITH A
LIST OF POTENTIAL WITNESSES.....539, LINE 19
- FAXED WITNESS LIST TO PANDILIDIS ON OCTOBER 23, DAY AFTER JURY
RETURNED ITS VERDICT.....540, LINE 10
- MITIGATION WITNESSES INCLUDED HIS MOTHER, BRIAN ANTEN
(LAWYER); ANGELO DEAN FROM HILLCREST SCHOOL; MIXTURE OF
FAMILY AND/OR SCHOOL OR JUVENILE HISTORY 542, LINE 1
- DIDN’T CALL ALL THE 31 WITNESSES BECAUSE IT WOULDN’T HAVE
BEEN TO FEARS’ BENEFIT; WOULD HAVE BEEN REPETITIVE, WHICH
MIGHT UPSET JURY542, LINE 20
- TRIED TO GET THE PEOPLE THEY THOUGHT WOULD BE THE BEST ONES
TO GIVE THE INFORMATION THEY WANTED TO GIVE 543, LINE 4
- GENERALLY, WOULD HAVE KNOWLEDGE OF WHAT WITNESSES WERE
GOING TO SAY; A GENERAL OVERVIEW..... 553, LINE 8
- WAS AWARE OF MRS. FEARS’ BURGLARY SITUATION558, LINE 16

EVALUATION OF PSYCHOLOGIST

- WASN’T CONCERNED ABOUT SMALLDON’S LACK OF CERTIFICATION;
STILL HAD DEGREE AND STILL WAS IN A POSITION TO BE A
PSYCHOLOGIST 529, LINE 2

RAISED MOTIONS; OBJECTED/MOVED FOR MISTRIAL

- RAISED MOTIONS IN FEARS’ CASE EVEN THOUGH THE HIGHEST COURT
IN OHIO HAS DECIDED THEY’RE NON-MERITORIOUS479, LINE 12

- ATTACKED THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE DEATH PENALTY SCHEME
IN OHIO, EVEN THOUGH IT’S BEEN DEEMED BY THE HIGHEST COURT
IN OHIO TO BE CONSTITUTIONAL479, LINE 18
- OBJECTED AND MOVED FOR MISTRIAL WHEN PROSECUTOR ASKED,
“MR. DEAN, HAS EVERY JUVENILE YOU HAVE DEALT WITH WITH A
RECORD LIKE THIS AND A HISTORY LIKE THIS, HAVE THEY ALL GONE
ON TO BE MURDERERS?”567, LINE 23
- RAISED THE ISSUE OF THE USE OF A MISDEMEANOR FOR IMPEACHMENT
PURPOSES568, LINE 25